



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,156	10/28/2003	Paramjit Kahlon	OIC0097US	6587
60975	7590	02/03/2010	EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL STEPHENSON LLP 11401 CENTURY OAKS TERRACE BLDG. H, SUITE 250 AUSTIN, TX 78758			OBEID, FAHD A	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
		3627		
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
02/03/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/696,156	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAHLON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> FAHD A. OBEID	<b>Art Unit</b> 3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No./Mail Date 10/07/2009

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

*Status of the Application*

1. This is in reply to communication filed on 12/07/2009.
2. No claims have been added.
3. Claims 25-32 remain cancelled.
4. Claims 1-3 and 9-11 have been amended.
5. Claims 1-24 are currently pending and have been examined.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. **Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-12, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880).**

10. Regarding Claims 1-3 and 9-11: Coleman discloses a computer implemented method comprising:

- synchronizing a source system with a target system, wherein the source system is one of a plurality of computer systems, the target system is another of the plurality of computer systems, and the synchronizing comprises (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13):
- extracting source inventory location information from a source inventory location record, wherein the extracting is performed by an integration server in response to a trigger, the trigger indicates that the synchronizing should be performed, the source inventory location information is in a source format, and the source format corresponds to the source system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13);
- converting the source inventory location information into an intermediate format (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13);
- converting the intermediate format into target inventory location information, wherein the target inventory location information is in a target format, and the target format corresponds to the target system (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13);

Coleman does not explicitly teach creating a new inventory location record in the target computerized inventory management system and updating an existing inventory location record in the target computerized inventory management system.

However, Balgeman does disclose the following:

- updating a target inventory location record with the target inventory location information, wherein the updating is performed by the integration server, the target inventory location record is in the target format, and the target inventory location record corresponds to the source inventory location record (abstract and claims 9-10).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Balgeman's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, to provide flexibility by allowing individual nodes to utilize different databases and which automatically updates corresponding records at different databases with a minimum of burden on the users (Balgeman; col 1 lns 67-68 and col 2 lns 1-2).

11. Regarding Claims 4 and 12: Coleman discloses a method of claim 1, wherein the intermediate format includes a list of inventory locations class with a hierarchy of data elements (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13).

12. Regarding Claims 6, 20, and 21: Coleman discloses a method of claim 5, wherein each of the plurality of address elements includes: an address identifier element; an address base data element, wherein the address data cleansing data element includes a disable cleansing flag element; an address data cleansing data element; an address relationship data element; and an address custom data element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13).

13. Regarding Claims 7 and 22: Coleman discloses a method of claim 6, wherein the address relationship data element includes: an address effective end date element; an address occupancy type code element; an address effective start date element; an address type code element; and an address list of roles element (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13).

14. **Claims 5, 8, 13-19, and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coleman (US 5,708,828) in view of Balgeman (US 5,446,880) as applied to claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-12, and 20-22 above, and further in view of He et al. (US 2004/0039576)**

15. Regarding Claims 5, 8, 13-19, and 23-24: the combination of Coleman and He et al. disclose a method of claim 4, wherein the hierarchy of data elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements, wherein each of the plurality of inventory location elements includes: an identifier for identifying the inventory location element; a base data element for defining: a location description; a location name; and a location type code; a list of addresses element for defining a plurality of address elements from a party class; a list of related business units elements for defining a plurality of business units associated with the inventory, and wherein each of the plurality of business units associated with the inventory includes an identifier element; a list of related inventory locations for defining a plurality of related inventory

locations; and a custom data element for defining customized attributes for the inventory (abstract, figs.2B, 3, col1 lns 9-13).

Coleman does not explicitly disclose inventory location elements.

However He et al. does disclose hierarchy of data elements includes a plurality of inventory location elements (abstract, fig.4, paras 10, 11, 18, 20, 24, and claim 1).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use He et al's teachings in Coleman's "system for converting data from input data using first format to output data using second format" enabled, for the advantage of minimizing inventory management data conversions and to facilitate data exchanging between customers and suppliers in the automotive industry. Also, to improve work management efficiency and to cut down operating costs (He et al; para 4).

*Response to Arguments*

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAHD A. OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Fahd A Obeid/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3627  
January 30, 2010

/F. Ryan Zeender/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627